PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY					2005
То		·			PEC'D OLI JUL 2005
	•		1.10		WIPO PCT
			4/8		
	see form	PCT/ISA/220		WRIT	TEN OPINION OF THE NAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
				(1	PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)
				Date of mailing	
				(day/month/year) se	e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
	licant's or agent's file		,	FOR FURTHER	ACTION
,	form PCT/ISA/2			See paragraph 2 belo	
•	International application No. International filing date PCT/IB2005/050194 17.01.2005			day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 20.01.2004
			both national classification	and IPC	
	9G5/00, G02B27			•	
• •	licant NINKLIJKE PHIL	IPS ELECTRO	ONICS NV		
			JA103, 14.V.		
1.	This opinion of	antaine indicatio	and valating to the fell		•
1.		mams mulcan	ons relating to the foll	owing items:	
	⊠ Box No. I	Basis of the op	Inion		
	☐ Box No. III	Priority Non-establishe	age of anisher with we we		
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of		ira to novelty, inventiv	e step and industrial applicability
	⊠ Box No. V	Reasoned state		:.1(a)(i) with regard to	novelty, inventive step or industrial
	☐ Box No. VI	Certain docume		supporting such state	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	☐ Box No. VII	Certain defects	in the international app	lication	
	Box No. VIII		ations on the internation		
2.	FURTHER ACTI	ON			
	the applicant cho	r the Internationa Joses an Authorit eau under Rule (u Preliminary Examining tv other than this one to	I Authority ("IPEA"). He be the IPEA and the c	usually be considered to be a owever, this does not apply where chosen IPEA has notifed the lonal Searching Authority
-	SUDDIVIDURE TO THE ILE	date of malling o	' together, where approx	oriate with amendmen	PEA; the applicant is invited to its, before the expiration of three of 22 months from the priority date,
	For further option	ns, see Form PC	T/ISA/220.		
3.			orm PCT/ISA/220.		
				•	•
			•		
Name	and mailing addres	s of the ISA:		Authorized Officer	
	<u></u>				. Paranessa.

Europ D-803

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465 Corsi, F

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7926 .



International application No. PCT/IB2005/050194

-						
_	Box N	lo. I Basis of the opinion				
1	. With r the la	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in he language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
	· ·	his opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following inguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search inder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).				
2.	2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
a. type of material:						
		a sequence listing				
		table(s) related to the sequence listing				
b. format of material:						
	. 🗖	in written format				
		in computer readable form				
	c. time	of filing/furnishing:				
		contained in the international application as filed.				
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.				
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.	CO	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto s been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional pies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as propriate, were furnished.				
1	Additio	nal commonto:				

International application No. PCT/IB2005/050194

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(l) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

3,9,10,12,17,18,20,23

No: Claims

1,2,4-8,11,13-16,19,21,22

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

3,12,20

No: Claims

1,2,4-11,13-19,21-23

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-23

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 1. Reference is made to the following documents, cited in the International Search Report:
 - D1: EP-A-1 178 460 (HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY) 6 February 2002 (2002-02-06)
 - D2: US-B1-6 304 286 (SHIRAI KAZUYUKI ET AL) 16 October 2001 (2001-10-16)
 - D3: US 2003/234799 A1 (LEE BEOM-SEOK) 25 December 2003 (2003-12-25)
 - D4: WO 01/93230 A (ZN VISION TECHNOLOGIES AG; WERNER, MARTIN; RINNE, MICHAEL; GEHLEN, STE) 6 December 2001 (2001-12-06)
- 2. The present reasoned statement has been based on assumptions for certain unclear claims as indicated under Item VIII below.
- 3. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1, 11 and 19 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT, for the following reasons.
- Document D1 discloses (see par. 1, par. 9, fig.1-3 and par. 12-18, par.22-24; the references in parentheses in the present paragraph applying to this document) a display system and a corresponding method of displaying information on a display device (digital display 25 in fig. 1 and 2), such system comprising a display processor (controller 48 in fig.2) which is configured to present information from a content source to the display device, and a detector (sensors 30, 32 and 34 in fig. 1 and 2) which is configured to detect a position of a viewer (V in fig.2) relative to the display device, where the display processor is configured to present the information to the display device based on the position of the viewer relative to the display device.

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050194

The skilled person would also directly and unambiguously understand that in the process of detecting the position of the viewer and consequently controlling the presented information, the processor of the display system must necessarily execute a computer program.

Therefore the combinations of features of each of claim 1, claim 11 and claim 19 are disclosed in D1.

3.2

Furthermore, a display system and a corresponding method of displaying information on a display device comprising the combinations of features of claim 1, claim 11 and claim 19 are disclosed also in D2 (see fig.1, col.1 lines 24-44, col.2 lines 29-49, fig. 3 and 4, col. 3 lines 17-58) and in D3 (see fig.1 and 2, par. 29-33).

4.

Dependent claims 2, 4-10,13-18 and 21-23 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, the reasons being as in the following.

4.1

In relation to claim 2, a display device is included in the display system disclosed in D1 (unit 25 in fig.1 and 2), in D2 (unit 15 in fig. 3) and in D3 (unit 10 in fig.1), which renders said claim not new.

4.2

In relation to claims 4, 13 and 21, presentation of information in an area that has a prominent position relative to the viewer is disclosed in D1 (see how the triangular image 58 is adjusted from fig.2 to fig, 3 for different positions of the viewer V), which renders said claims not new.

4.3

In relation to claims 5 and 14, presentation of information originating from a network is disclosed in D1 (see par. 16), which renders said claims not new.

4.4

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050194

In relation to claims 6 and 15, the detection of the viewer position by means of infrared devices is disclosed in D2 (see col. 3 lines 47-58), and the same detection by means of reflected energy is disclosed in D1 (see par.24, indicating the use of generic scanning beam technologies, such as those used in radars), which renders said claims not new. Furthermore heat detection would be normally associated to the use of infrared devices, and it would also be obvious to use other well known position detection techniques, such as cameras and image detectors (see e.g. D4, page 7 par.7 - page 8 par.1).

4.5

专

In relation to claim 7, D2 discloses (see fig. 3, col.3 lines 41-58) a position detector that actually estimates a projection of the image of the viewer on the surface of the display device ("infrared shadows" projected on the surface of the sensors 12a-12c by the viewer in the different positions 19a-19e), which renders said claim not new.

4.6

In relation to claims 8, 16 and 22, D1 discloses control of location and content of the information on the display device based on the position of the viewer (see ref. in par. 4.2 above; the location of the triangle 58 in fig. 2 and 3 is adjusted, and consequently the whole content of the displayed information), which renders said claims not new. Furthermore, control of the size of the displayed information based on said position is disclosed in D3 (see ref. in par. 3.2 above).

4.7

In relation to claims 9, 10, 17, 18 and 23, display systems that comprise a recognition system arranged to identify a viewer, where a display processor presents information on a display device depending on such identification, after selecting a profile in a corresponding database, are well known, see e.g. D4 (page 1 par.4 - page 3 par.3; page 4 par. 2-3; fig.1, page 7 par.7 - page 9 par.3); the skilled person would introduce such a recognition system in the display systems of documents D1-D3 without use of any inventive skill. Therefore claims 9, 10, 17, 18 and 23 would be obvious to the skilled person.

5.

Dependent claims 3, 12 and 20 are considered to satisfy the requirements of the PCT in respect to novelty and inventive step, since they indicate the determination of an area, on

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050194

the surface of the display device, that corresponds to a reflection of the viewer, based on the detected viewer position, and the consequent positioning of the displayed information so as to avoid such area, by which the problem is solved, to avoid that the displayed information be overlapped with the reflection of the viewer on the display; neither such problem nor its solution are known from or hinted at in any way in the available prior art.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

- The meaning of the following expressions and sentences is not clear and consequently the subject matter of the corresponding claims is unclear, Article 6 PCT.
- 1.1 "the display device is reflective" in claim 3 (line 2) and in claim 12 (line 2), as the indication "reflective display" is commonly used for displays that modulate the ambient light after reflection on a suitable surface (e.g. reflective LCDs, where a reflective surface is combined with a diffuser), whereas based on the description (see fig.1, page 3 lines 4-18) the indication appears to refer to the reflective surface of a mirror, on which information is displayed.
 - For drafting the reasoned statement in item V said unclear expression has been construed in conformity with the description.
- 1.2 "area corresponding to a reflection of the viewer" in claim 3 (lines 4 and 5), as it is not clear to which reflection reference is made.
 - For drafting the reasoned statement in item V, in conformity with the description (see ref. in par. 1.1. above) and with claims 12 and 20, said unclear expression has been construed as indicating an area corresponding to a reflection of the viewer on the display surface of the display device.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

see form PCT/ISA/220 See form PCT/ISA/220 WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORI (PCT Rule 43bis.1)		n the ERNATIONAL SEA	ARCHING AUTH	IORITY	•	2005
International application No. Priority Priority Pox No. Priority P	То	•		4/8		WIPO PCT
Applicants or agent's file reference See form PCT/SA220 FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		see form	PCT/ISA/220	10		
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA&220 International application No. PCT/B2005/050194 International application No. PCT/B2005/050194 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Box No. II Box No. II Box No. V Box No. V Box No. V Box No. V Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain documents cited Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Certain defects in the inte						(PCT Rule 43bis.1)
International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority						see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
PCT/B2005/050194 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G09G5/00, G02B27/00 Applicant KONINKLUKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. IV Priority Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V. Reasoned statement under Rule 43b/s.1(a)(f) with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.						
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application FUHTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the international Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer	PC	T/IB2005/050194	.	17.01.2005		1
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion	G09	9G5/00, G02B27	ssification (IPC) or //00	both national classification	and IPC	•
Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain observations on the international application Purities Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international Preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notited the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and malling address of the ISA: Authorized Officer			IPS ELECTRO	ONICS, N.V.		
Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain decuments cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international Preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	1.	This opinion co	ontains indication	ons relating to the foll	owing items:	
□ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and malling address of the ISA: Authorized Officer						
□ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observa		☐ Box No. II				•
Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Further Action If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.		☐ Box No. III		nent of opinion with rega	ard to novelty. Invent	tive sten and industrial applicability
applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer		☐ Box No. IV	Lack of unity of	finvention		
Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 65.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer		_	Reasoned state applicability; cit	ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> tations and explanations	s.1(a)(i) with regard to s supporting such sta	o novelty, inventive step or industrial
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized Officer						•
2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized Officer				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized Officer	•	⊠ Box No. VIII	Certain observa	ations on the internation	al application	·
the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer	2.	FURTHER ACTI	ON		•	
months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer		the applicant cho International Bure	oses an Authorit eau under Rule (u Freiiminary Examining V other than this one to	J Authority ("IPEA"), be the IPEA and the	However, this does not apply where
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer		months from the	date of malling o	' Louelfier, where appror	oliaie With amandm	ante hotoro the expiration of the
Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer		For further option	is, see Form PC	T/ISA/220.		
. —	3.	For further details	s, see notes to F	orm PCT/ISA/220.		•
. —		•				
· • PPIA-	Vame	and mailing addres:	s of the ISA:		Authorized Officer	Net Palane.



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Corsi, F

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7926



International application No. PCT/IB2005/050194

+	Pay No.	Decis of the animies				
	Box No.	Basis of the opinion				
1.	With rega	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
	This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).					
2.	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
	a. type of material:					
	□ as	sequence listing				
	□ tal	ole(s) related to the sequence listing				
	b. format of	of material:				
	□ in	written format				
	□ in	computer readable form				
•	c. time of f	iling/furnishing:				
	🗆 со	ntained in the international application as filed.				
	☐ file	d together with the international application in computer readable form.				
	☐ fur	nished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.	copies	lition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto en filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional is is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as oriate, were furnished.				
1	Additional					

International application No. PCT/IB2005/050194

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

3,9,10,12,17,18,20,23

No: Cla

Claims

1,2,4-8,11,13-16,19,21,22

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

3,12,20

No: Claims

1,2,4-11,13-19,21-23

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-23

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- Reference is made to the following documents, cited in the International Search Report:
 - D1: EP-A-1 178 460 (HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY) 6 February 2002 (2002-02-06)
 - D2: US-B1-6 304 286 (SHIRAI KAZUYUKI ET AL) 16 October 2001 (2001-10-16)
 - D3: US 2003/234799 A1 (LEE BEOM-SEOK) 25 December 2003 (2003-12-25)
 - D4: WO 01/93230 A (ZN VISION TECHNOLOGIES AG; WERNER, MARTIN; RINNE, MICHAEL; GEHLEN, STE) 6 December 2001 (2001-12-06)
- 2. The present reasoned statement has been based on assumptions for certain unclear claims as indicated under Item VIII below.
- 3. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1, 11 and 19 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT, for the following reasons.
- Document D1 discloses (see par. 1, par. 9, fig.1-3 and par. 12-18, par.22-24; the references in parentheses in the present paragraph applying to this document) a display system and a corresponding method of displaying information on a display device (digital display 25 in fig. 1 and 2), such system comprising a display processor (controller 48 in fig.2) which is configured to present information from a content source to the display device, and a detector (sensors 30, 32 and 34 in fig. 1 and 2) which is configured to detect a position of a viewer (V in fig.2) relative to the display device, where the display processor is configured to present the information to the display device based on the position of the viewer relative to the display device.

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050194

The skilled person would also directly and unambiguously understand that in the process of detecting the position of the viewer and consequently controlling the presented information, the processor of the display system must necessarily execute a computer program.

Therefore the combinations of features of each of claim 1, claim 11 and claim 19 are disclosed in D1.

3.2

Furthermore, a display system and a corresponding method of displaying information on a display device comprising the combinations of features of claim 1, claim 11 and claim 19 are disclosed also in D2 (see fig.1, col.1 lines 24-44, col.2 lines 29-49, fig. 3 and 4, col. 3 lines 17-58) and in D3 (see fig.1 and 2, par. 29-33).

4.

Dependent claims 2, 4-10,13-18 and 21-23 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, the reasons being as in the following.

4.1

In relation to claim 2, a display device is included in the display system disclosed in D1 (unit 25 in fig.1 and 2), in D2 (unit 15 in fig. 3) and in D3 (unit 10 in fig.1), which renders said claim not new.

4.2

In relation to claims 4, 13 and 21, presentation of information in an area that has a prominent position relative to the viewer is disclosed in D1 (see how the triangular image 58 is adjusted from fig.2 to fig, 3 for different positions of the viewer V), which renders said claims not new.

4.3

In relation to claims 5 and 14, presentation of information originating from a network is disclosed in D1 (see par. 16), which renders said claims not new.

4.4

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050194

In relation to claims 6 and 15, the detection of the viewer position by means of infrared devices is disclosed in D2 (see col. 3 lines 47-58), and the same detection by means of reflected energy is disclosed in D1 (see par.24, indicating the use of generic scanning beam technologies, such as those used in radars), which renders said claims not new. Furthermore heat detection would be normally associated to the use of infrared devices, and it would also be obvious to use other well known position detection techniques, such as cameras and image detectors (see e.g. D4, page 7 par.7 - page 8 par.1).

4.5

In relation to claim 7, D2 discloses (see fig. 3, col.3 lines 41-58) a position detector that actually estimates a projection of the image of the viewer on the surface of the display device ("infrared shadows" projected on the surface of the sensors 12a-12c by the viewer in the different positions 19a-19e), which renders said claim not new.

4.6

In relation to claims 8, 16 and 22, D1 discloses control of location and content of the information on the display device based on the position of the viewer (see ref. in par. 4.2 above; the location of the triangle 58 in fig. 2 and 3 is adjusted, and consequently the whole content of the displayed information), which renders said claims not new. Furthermore, control of the size of the displayed information based on said position is disclosed in D3 (see ref. in par. 3.2 above).

4.7

In relation to claims 9, 10, 17, 18 and 23, display systems that comprise a recognition system arranged to identify a viewer, where a display processor presents information on a display device depending on such identification, after selecting a profile in a corresponding database, are well known, see e.g. D4 (page 1 par.4 - page 3 par.3; page 4 par. 2-3; fig.1, page 7 par.7 - page 9 par.3); the skilled person would introduce such a recognition system in the display systems of documents D1-D3 without use of any inventive skill. Therefore claims 9, 10, 17, 18 and 23 would be obvious to the skilled person.

5.

Dependent claims 3, 12 and 20 are considered to satisfy the requirements of the PCT in respect to novelty and inventive step, since they indicate the determination of an area, on

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050194

the surface of the display device, that corresponds to a reflection of the viewer, based on the detected viewer position, and the consequent positioning of the displayed information so as to avoid such area, by which the problem is solved, to avoid that the displayed information be overlapped with the reflection of the viewer on the display; neither such problem nor its solution are known from or hinted at in any way in the available prior art.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

- The meaning of the following expressions and sentences is not clear and consequently the subject matter of the corresponding claims is unclear, Article 6 PCT.
- 1.1 "the display device is reflective" in claim 3 (line 2) and in claim 12 (line 2), as the indication "reflective display" is commonly used for displays that modulate the ambient light after reflection on a suitable surface (e.g. reflective LCDs, where a reflective surface is combined with a diffuser), whereas based on the description (see fig.1, page 3 lines 4-18) the indication appears to refer to the reflective surface of a mirror, on which information is displayed.
 - For drafting the reasoned statement in item V said unclear expression has been construed in conformity with the description.
- 1.2 "area corresponding to a reflection of the viewer" in claim 3 (lines 4 and 5), as it is not clear to which reflection reference is made.
 - For drafting the reasoned statement in item V, in conformity with the description (see ref. in par. 1.1. above) and with claims 12 and 20, said unclear expression has been construed as indicating an area corresponding to a reflection of the viewer on the display surface of the display device.